

*Katie & Steve Sheppard
622 North Street
Decorah, IA 52101*

October 11, 2016

Iowa Utilities Board
1375 E. Court Avenue, Room 69
Des Moines, Iowa 50319-0069

Re: Docket TF-2016-321: Alliant/IPL Net Billing Proposal

To Whom It May Concern:

We offer the following comments in response to the Alliant Energy/IPL proposed changes for net metering tariffs, as requested by the Board on July 19, 2016.

First, we wish to express our appreciation to the Board for its thoughtful consideration of this important and complex issue for the state of Iowa. We recognize that there are many constituents to be served in considering the net metering question. We were pleased at the Board's decision in July to continue the essential components of net metering for the next three years, as the options for equitable resolution continue to be assessed. As users of solar energy for both home electricity and domestic water heat, we feel that the July decision was in keeping with the state's express intention of "expanding renewable distributed generation in Iowa." We are very proud of Iowa's support for this position, on behalf of our population, the environment and the global energy future.

Second, in light of the above thinking, we were disappointed to learn of the restrictive proposal submitted by Alliant Energy. We felt that the proposal attempted to further the attempt to "penalize" and restrict those consumers who have already or who may soon opt for distributed generation systems. The proposal did not comply with either the letter or spirit of the Board's July 19 conclusions. The proposal's artificial capping of distributed generation system sizes is absolutely contrary to the state's objective of encouraging use of alternative energy systems. Their formula for calculating customer load appears to be in direct contradiction of this docket's position that net metering should

apply to a customer's total annual energy use. Further, the Alliant proposal does not take into account any differential position with regard to existing systems, versus systems to be installed in the future; at the very least, existing systems should be afforded some form of "grandfathering" so as not to penalize those customers who have made the investment in and commitment to solar use.

Third, we therefore respectfully request that the Board reject Alliant's proposal and direct them to resubmit a plan that is in line with the Board's July 19 conclusions, including provisions for:

- a.) Use of a simple formula for determining a customer's load based upon actual or historical energy use, and consistent with the extensive input provided to this docket over the past two years;
- b.) Allowing customers the choice of either a January 1 or April 1 cash-out of excess credit;
- c.) Abiding by IPL's board-approved avoided cost rate provisions;
- d.) Ensuring that the net metering/billing tariff is open to all customers and that the tariff remains available for the specified 20 years in case of an ownership change and tariff change.

We believe that the above-mentioned requests are reasonable and within the spirit of the July IUB conclusions. We ask that Alliant/IPL be held to those conclusions in resubmitting any subsequent proposal, thus supporting this state's intention to be a leader in alternative energy development.

Thank you in advance for your consideration of our concerns. Please feel free to contact us if further information would be of additional value.

Sincerely,

Katie & Steve Sheppard

